

**REMARKS**

**I.           Status**

The Office Action indicates claims 1-28 to be pending in this Application.

Claims 1-12, 15-22, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brachman (U.S. Patent No. 6,704,576) in view of Nobuyasu (U.S. Patent No. 6,597,673).

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brachman and Nobuyasu in view of Stanforth (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0058502).

Claims 23, 24, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brachman and Nobuyasu in view of Khan (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0143951).

Claims 1-12 are independent.

**II.           Rejection of Independent Claims under 35 U.S.C. 103**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brachman in view of Nobuyasu.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Brachman and Nobuyasu, taken individually or in combination, fail, for example, to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... wherein each said provision comprises indication of a plurality of cells with which a member of said one or more members is capable of communicating ...”

as set forth in each of claims 1-12 (emphasis added).

The Office Action, apparently viewing a mobile station establishing a wireless link with a base station as involving that mobile station giving a provision comprising indication

of a cell with which it is capable of communicating, points to Nobuyasu's discussion that "wireless links are established with a plurality of base stations simultaneously."

However, Applicants respectfully submit that even if such view is, for the sake of argument, taken to be valid, Brachman and Nobuyasu, taken individually or in combination, would fail, for instance, to disclose, teach, or suggest provisions wherein each provision comprises indication of a plurality of cells, and instead would merely discuss giving with respect to each base station a provision comprising indication of only the single cell corresponding to that particular base station.

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-12, as well as those claims that depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

### **III. Dependent Claims**

Applicants do not believe it is necessary at this time to further address the rejections of the dependent claims as Applicants believe that the foregoing places the independent claims in condition for allowance. Applicants, however, reserve the right to further address those rejections in the future should such a response be deemed necessary and appropriate.

*(Continued on next page)*

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that this Application is in condition for allowance for which action is earnestly solicited.

If a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution of this Application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required for this response, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4057.

Furthermore, in the event that an extension of time is required, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the above-noted Deposit Account and Order No.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Angus R. Gill  
Registration No. 51,133

Dated: September 25, 2008

**Mailing Address:**

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, New York 10281-2101  
(212) 415-8700  
(212) 415-8701 (Fax)